

UV renormalons in QCD and their phenomenological implications .*

S. Peris^{a † ‡}

^aGrup de Fisica Teorica and IFAE, Universitat Autonoma de Barcelona, 08193 Bellaterra (Barcelona), Spain. E-mail: peris@ifae.es

I report on some recent work done in collaboration with E. de Rafael on the connection between ultraviolet renormalons in QCD and Nambu-Jona-Lasinio-like Lagrangians as its effective description at low energies.

In a superconductor [1], let us denote by V the lowest order amplitude for two electrons to scatter off each other through the exchange of a phonon (V is a negative number). We shall assume both electrons are outside but very close to the Fermi sphere and we shall approximate V to be a constant. One can see that the total amplitude for this scattering process is actually an infinite sum

$$T \approx V (1 + \gamma V + \gamma^2 V^2 + \dots) \quad (1)$$

where $\gamma \sim \kappa^{-1} \log(E/\omega)$, with $\kappa > 0$ a constant depending on the metal, ω a parameter describing the effective interaction range (in momentum space) and E is the total energy of the electron pair. Under normal conditions γV is small and the above series can be truncated after the first few terms. However, when E is very small more and more terms become important and one has to consider the resummation of the series (1):

$$T = \frac{V}{1 - \gamma V} \quad (2)$$

This matrix element has a pole at

$$E = \omega e^{-\kappa/|V|} \quad (3)$$

clearly something goes wrong with our perturbative description when the energy reaches the value of eq. (3). Of course what goes wrong is that Cooper pairs form and the phenomenon of superconductivity takes place. The dependence of the energy on the strength of the interaction

(i.e. V) takes a *nonanalytic* form such as eq. (3). This is not surprising physically, one should not have expected to be able to describe a nonperturbative effect like the formation of Cooper pairs just by analytically continuing in the strength of the interaction V starting from the perturbative regime (eqs. (1-3)). This is an example of how perturbation theory may signal the existence of nonperturbative effects.

With an ordinary superconductor this is of course not the end of the story. One can go a long way beyond eqs. (2,3) by applying the machinery of the Bogoliubov transformation to actually solve the quantum-mechanical system, describe its excitations and so on. The reason is of course because the phenomenon of superconductivity is a rather well-understood one.

How about QCD ? Regretfully it is very clear that QCD is much more difficult as a nonperturbative theory. But perhaps the previous example may make us harbor some hope that studying the analytic properties of the perturbative series may shed some light on some aspects of the nonperturbative dynamics. Therefore, in this sense, one may ask:

are there specific perturbative signatures of chiral symmetry breaking ? [2]

To try to answer this question, let us adopt one simplification right from the start and take the large- N_c limit of massless QCD [10]. This limit presumably captures all the important ingredients of the full QCD and in particular allows a proof of chiral symmetry breaking [11].

We shall study a concrete example: let $\mathcal{A}(Q^2)$

*UAB-FT-424/97

[†]Talk given at the workshop "QCD 97", Montpellier, France, July 1997. To appear in the proceedings.

[‡]Work partially supported by research project CICYT-AEN95-0882.

be the Adler function defined by ($Q^2 \equiv -q^2$, with $Q^2 > 0$ for q^2 -spacelike)

$$\mathcal{A}(Q^2) \equiv -Q^2 \frac{\partial \Pi}{\partial Q^2}. \quad (4)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi^{\mu\nu}(q) &= i \int d^4x e^{iq \cdot x} \langle 0 | T \{ V^\mu(x) V^\nu(0) \} | 0 \rangle \\ &= -(g^{\mu\nu} q^2 - q^\mu q^\nu) \Pi(q^2) \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

with

$$V^\mu = \frac{1}{2} (: \bar{u} \gamma^\mu u : - : \bar{d} \gamma^\mu d :) \quad (6)$$

the vector-isovector quark current. Within the context of QED, it was recognized long ago by 't Hooft [12] and Lautrup [13] that the exchange of the effective charge, i.e. an infinite string of “vacuum polarization insertions” [3] is responsible for an $n!$ behavior of the n -th coefficient in the perturbative expansion in the coupling constant when n is very large. A series of this sort has zero radius of convergence and as such can not be resummed (i.e. analytically continued in the coupling constant).

For a nonabelian theory like QCD the explicit construction of the corresponding effective charge is of course much more difficult. However it can be worked out [14] with the use of what is called the pinch technique [15] with properties completely analogous to those of the QED one [16]. In particular one also reproduces the full first coefficient of the β function. This is an important ingredient when trying to understand chiral symmetry breaking since the β function is the only seed of scale symmetry breaking in perturbation theory and, clearly, chiral symmetry breaking is intimately linked to the appearance of scales in QCD.

In the particular case of the Adler function in QCD suffice it to say that when the euclidean virtual momentum going through the internal gluonic bubble chain k_E is much smaller than the large external momentum Q one can approximate:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A}(Q^2)|_{\text{IR}} &\approx \frac{N_c}{16\pi^2} C_F \frac{1}{2\pi b_0} \\ &\int_0^\infty dw e^{-\frac{w}{b_0 \alpha(Q^2)}} \frac{w}{2-w} \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

where the change of variables

$$w/2 = -b_0 \alpha(Q^2) \log k_E^2/Q^2, \quad (8)$$

has been made. Here $b_0 > 0$ is the first coefficient of the QCD β function. Equation (7) is already written in the form of a Borel transform [17]. One can obtain the perturbative series in $\alpha(Q^2)$ from (7) by expanding the fraction in powers of w . Upon integration this produces an $n!$ growth of the perturbative coefficients that yields a divergent series. The fraction $w/2 - w$ in eq. (7) is obtained after analytically continuing in the w plane for w complex. This can be considered as a resummation of the perturbative series in $\alpha(Q^2)$ insofar as the integral exists.

But the integral in eq. (7) does not exist. The integrand has a pole at $w = 2$. This pole is called an infrared renormalon and it can be traced back to a singularity at the Landau pole in momentum space, Λ_L [4]. We are in a similar situation as in eq. (2). If perturbation theory were the whole story eq. (7) would imply that $\mathcal{A}(Q^2)$ is ambiguous, a most disastrous conclusion for a physical observable! Of course perturbation theory is not the whole story and it is only when nonperturbative contributions are added to the perturbative contributions to eq. (4) that the final answer for $\mathcal{A}(Q^2)$ is physical and unambiguous [18]. But just as we did in our initial example of the superconducting metal we can use perturbation theory for guessing what sort of nonperturbative contributions we are missing in eq. (7) by parametrizing its ambiguity. This can be done simply by choosing the integration contour from above or from below the singularity at $w = 2$,

$$\delta \mathcal{A}(Q^2)|_{\text{IR}} \sim e^{-2/b_0 \alpha(Q)} \sim \left(\frac{\Lambda_L}{Q} \right)^4, \quad (9)$$

where the one-loop running coupling constant has been used in the last step [5]. Equation (9) suggests the existence of a nonperturbative contribution behaving like Q^{-4} at large Q^2 . This is how perturbation theory hints at the gluon condensate.

Let us go back to the Adler function and consider now the contribution in the regime where

$k_E^2 \gg Q^2$. One finds

$$\mathcal{A}(Q^2)|_{UV} \approx \frac{N_c}{16\pi^2} C_F \frac{4}{9} \frac{1}{2\pi b_0} \int_0^\infty dw e^{-\frac{w}{b_0\alpha(Q^2)}} \frac{1}{(1+w)^2} \quad (10)$$

with $w = b_0\alpha(Q^2) \log k_E^2/Q^2$. The singularity in the w plane is now at $w = -1$ and consequently the integral can be carried out. This singularity is called an ultraviolet renormalon. Equation (10) could then be considered a resummation of the perturbative series that is obtained by expanding the fraction in powers of the variable w . This produces the alternating series $\sim N_c(-1)^n(b_0\alpha(Q^2))^nn!$. Unlike the case of the infrared renormalon, perturbation theory does not send any signal about the existence of nonperturbative contributions in the form of an ambiguity caused by a singularity in the integration region[6].

However, as Vainshtein and Zakharov [20] first noticed, the contribution from two bubble chains[7] actually dominates the asymptotics of the perturbative coefficients in α over the contribution coming from just one chain, eq. (10). The way to understand this is as follows: the vacuum polarization tensor (5) verifies

$$\frac{-i}{2} \int_{k_E^2 \geq Q^2} \frac{d^4k}{(2\pi)^4} \quad \Pi^{\mu\nu}(q) v^\mu v^\nu = \frac{4\pi\alpha(k_E^2)}{k^2} \langle v | \frac{\mathcal{T}}{k^2} | v \rangle \quad (11)$$

where v is taken as an external field coupled to the isospin current and

$$\mathcal{T} \equiv i k^2 \int d^4x e^{ik \cdot x} \text{T} \left\{ : \bar{q}(x) \gamma^\mu \frac{\lambda^a}{2} q(x) : \right. \\ \left. : \bar{q}(0) \gamma_\mu \frac{\lambda^a}{2} q(0) : \right\}, \quad (12)$$

where λ^a are the Gell-Mann matrices in color space. The crucial observation of V-Z is that $\mathcal{T}$ admits an operator product expansion at large k^2 whose first physically relevant terms start at *dimension six* ($F_{\mu\nu}(x)^{ext}$ below is the field strength of the field v):

$$\mathcal{T} \approx N_c \frac{c_1(k^2)}{k^2} \bar{q}(0) \gamma^\mu D^\alpha F_{\alpha\mu}^{ext}(0) q(0)$$

$$+ \frac{c_2^V(k^2)}{k^2} \left[\sum_{a,b} | \bar{q}_L^a \gamma^\mu q_L^b |^2 + (L \rightarrow R) \right] \\ + \frac{c_2^S(k^2)}{k^2} \left[\sum_{a,b} (\bar{q}_L^a q_R^b) (\bar{q}_R^b q_L^a) \right] \\ + N_c \frac{c_3(k^2)}{k^2} f_{ABC} G_{\mu\nu}^A G_\rho^{\nu B} G^{\rho\mu C} + \dots, \quad (13)$$

where the ellipses stand for dimension-eight operators and higher. The contribution of one chain yields $c_1 = 2/3, c_2^V = c_2^S = c_3 = 0$. At the level of two chains, one has $c_1 = 0, c_2^V = 2N_c\pi\alpha(k^2), c_2^S = -32N_c\pi\alpha(k^2), c_3 = 0$ [21][8]. As one considers diagrams with chains of an increasing complexity one will find that the coefficients c_i in the OPE have themselves an expansion in powers of $\alpha(k^2)$.

Computing the matrix element $\langle v | \mathcal{T} | v \rangle$ in eq. (11) to get to $\mathcal{A}(Q^2)$ in eq. (4) is tantamount to computing the mixing of the operators (13) into the operator $(\partial_\mu F_{ext}^{\mu\nu})^2$. We are only interested in this mixing at one loop since this order resums equal powers of the logarithms and the coupling constant $\alpha(Q^2)$, i.e. terms of the form $[\alpha(Q^2) \log k^2/Q^2]^n$ which are leading contributions to the asymptotics $\sim \alpha^n n!$ since every power of log is eventually transformed into a power of n . Considering the mixing only at one loop, the triple gluon operator $f_{ABC} G_{\mu\nu}^A G_\rho^{\nu B} G^{\rho\mu C}$ drops out of the problem since it does not mix with the operators of eq. (13) nor with $(\partial_\mu F_{ext}^{\mu\nu})^2$ [22]. For simplicity of presentation I will also ignore the presence of the anomalous dimension matrix. This will change nothing of the physics I am discussing and, if need be, it can always be taken into account [23].

The final contribution to the Adler function can be calculated through eq. (11) and turns out to be dominated by *the vector-like four-quark operator*, whose coefficient is c_2^V in eq. (13), and yields

$$\mathcal{A}(Q^2)|_{UV}^{\text{two chains}} = \frac{2}{9} \frac{N_c}{16\pi^2} \left(\frac{N_c}{2} \frac{1}{2\pi b_0} \right)^2 \\ \int_0^\infty dw e^{-\frac{w}{b_0\alpha(Q^2)}} \frac{w}{(1+w)^3}, \quad (14)$$

which in perturbation theory means an asymptotic behavior $\sim N_c(-1)^n(b_0\alpha(Q^2))^n(n+1)!$. Diagrams with an increasing complexity multiply

the result (14) by a factor χ whose value is beyond any known approximation scheme, presumably involving an infinite-number-of-loops calculation. I would like to stress here that the fact that a four-quark operator is the one that dominates is true not only for the vector channel and the Adler function but also for the scalar channel and its corresponding associated function (and also for the axial-vector and pseudoscalar respectively)[21].

It is of course natural to try to associate this four-quark operators with some sort of an effective Nambu-Jona-Lasinio (NJL) Lagrangian [24] [20]. However two obvious difficulties are immediately encountered. Firstly a NJL-like Lagrangian, being a Lagrangian, has to be local which in turn requires a scale to appear in the denominator of the dimension-six four-quark operators of eq. (13) instead of the floating virtual momentum k^2 . Secondly, a NJL type of Lagrangian can make sense only as an effective description at low energies, whereas up to now all momenta k^2 and Q^2 have been considered to be large. As we shall see the above two points are actually related.

What does this mean? Let us look at the same calculations but now in the low-energy regime, i.e. when $Q^2 \rightarrow 0$. The contribution to the Adler function from the diagram with two chains is then

$$A(Q^2) \sim N_c^3 Q^2 \int_{Q^2}^{\infty} \frac{dk_E^2}{k_E^4} [\alpha(k_E^2)]^2 \log^2 \frac{k_E^2}{Q^2}. \quad (15)$$

Using the previous change of variable $w = b_0 \alpha(Q^2) \log k_E^2 / Q^2$ where now $\alpha(Q^2)$ is *defined* as[9]

$$\alpha(Q^2) \equiv \frac{\alpha(\mu^2)}{(1 + b_0 \alpha(\mu^2) \log(Q^2 / \mu^2))} \quad (16)$$

for the entire range of its argument Q^2 (so that for instance $\alpha(Q^2) < 0$ if $Q^2 < \Lambda_L^2$) one finds

$$A(Q^2) \sim \frac{N_c}{b_0 |\alpha(Q^2)|} \int_0^{\infty} dw e^{-\frac{w}{b_0 |\alpha(Q^2)|}} \frac{w^2}{(1-w)^2}. \quad (17)$$

Unlike in the usual case ($Q^2 > \Lambda_L^2$), now ($Q^2 < \Lambda_L^2$) we find a pole in the integration region

for the contribution of the ultraviolet renormalon. Contributions from more complex diagrams will introduce a multiplicative factor in front of eq. (17). This singularity causes the integral to be ambiguous. This ambiguity can be parametrized as

$$\delta A(Q^2)_{Q^2 < \Lambda_L^2} = -\mathcal{K} \frac{N_c}{16\pi^2} \left(\frac{N_c}{2} \frac{1}{2\pi b_0} \right)^2 \frac{Q^2}{\Lambda_L^2} \left(\frac{1}{9} \log^2 \frac{\Lambda_L^2}{Q^2} + \dots \right), \quad (18)$$

with $\mathcal{K}$ an unknown constant. This ambiguity is of the same form as the insertion of the dimension-six operator

$$\mathcal{O}_V = -\frac{8\pi^2 G_V}{N_c \Lambda_\chi^2} \sum_{a,b=\text{flavour}} [(\bar{q}_L^a \gamma^\mu q_L^b) (\bar{q}_L^b \gamma_\mu q_L^a) + (\text{L} \rightarrow \text{R})] \quad (19)$$

provided one interprets Λ_L^2 as the momentum cutoff in the loops, $\Lambda_\chi \simeq \Lambda_L$ and one identifies $4G_V \equiv -\mathcal{K} \left(\frac{1}{2\pi b_0} \frac{N_c}{2} \right)^2$. This is precisely one of the four-quark operators appearing in the extended Nambu-Jona-Lasinio model [25]. Repeating the same analysis for the pseudoscalar two-point function will lead to the other four-quark operator of this model. These two are the four-quark operators we already encountered in eq. (13) but now they are truly local operators, i.e. they have a true constant in the denominator, not the virtual floating momentum k^2 as in eq. (13). Therefore they can be considered as an honest to goodness interaction in an effective local Lagrangian.

The ENJL model has proven itself very successful in predicting the low-energy chiral Lagrangian of Gasser and Leutwyler[26] but its possible connection with QCD has remained very elusive so far. Renormalons suggest a, in my opinion, very remarkable connection between perturbation theory in QCD and ENJL, and answer with a “yes” the question posed at the beginning since it is the same four-quark operators that are responsible for i) the asymptotic behavior of the perturbative series of two-point functions in QCD and ii) for the breakdown of chiral symmetry. Although this

does not constitute a proof, it may be considered unlikely that it be a pure coincidence.

Returning to my initial example, it is interesting how also superconductivity is the effect of a four-fermion operator turning relevant at low energies [27]. At the very least I think one can take these considerations as some intriguing evidence in favor of ENJL as an effective description of QCD in the low-energy regime.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank F. Lopez Aguilar for discussions on Superconductivity.

REFERENCES

1. J.M. Ziman, Principles of the Theory of Solids, Cambridge U. Press, chapter 11.
2. F. Wilczek, hep-ph/9311302. Invited talk given at the Cornell Lepton-Photon Conference, Ithaca, N.Y., August 1993. Actually Wilczek also asked the same question about confinement. I will refer the reader to the contribution to these proceedings on this issue by F. Yndurain.
3. See fig. 1 in ref. [21].
4. This is strictly true only with a one-loop β function [19].
5. Without loss of generality one could consider a scheme where only the first two coefficients of the β function are non-zero[12] with the same physical conclusions.
6. For the connection between ultraviolet renormalons and possible Q^{-2} nonperturbative contributions see R. Akhoury and V.I. Zakharov hep-ph/9705318, G.Grunberg hep-ph/9705290 and the contribution by V. I. Zakharov to these proceedings.
7. See fig. 6 in ref.[21].
8. For possible interpretations of why $|c_2^S| \gg |c_2^V|$ see R. Akhoury and V.I. Zakharov hep-ph/9705318, C.J. Maxwell hep-ph/9706231 and the corresponding contributions by C.J. Maxwell and V.I. Zakharov to these proceedings.
9. This can be considered as an analytic continuation in $\alpha(\mu^2) \log Q^2/\mu^2$.
10. G. 't Hooft, Nucl. Phys. **B160** (1979) 57. See also E. Witten, Nucl. Phys. **B160** (1979) 57.
11. S. Coleman and E. Witten, Phys. Rev. Lett. **45** (1980) 100.
12. G. 't Hooft, in The Whys of Subnuclear Physics, Erice 1977, ed. A. Zichichi, Plenum, New York 1977.
13. B. Lautrup, Phys. Lett. **69B** (1977) 109.
14. N.J. Watson, Nucl. Phys. **B494** (1997) 388.
15. J.M. Cornwall, in Proceedings of the French-American Seminar on Theoretical Aspects of Quantum Chromodynamics, Marseille, France, 1981, ed. J.W. Dash, Centre de Physique Théorique report no. CPT-81/P-1345, (1982). J.M. Cornwall, Phys. Rev. **D26** (1982) 1453; J.M. Cornwall and J.M. Papavassiliou Phys. Rev. **D40** (1989) 3474; J. Papavassiliou, Phys. Rev. **D41**, 3179 (1990); G. Degraffi and A. Sirlin, Phys. Rev. **D46**, 3104 (1992); N.J. Watson, Phys. Lett. **B349**, 155 (1995).
16. J. Papavassiliou, E. de Rafael and N.J. Watson, hep-ph/9612237.
17. J.C. Le Guillou and J. Zinn-Justin, Large-Order Behaviour of Perturbation Theory, Current Physics Sources and Comments, Vol. 7, North-Holland (1990).
18. A.H. Mueller, Nucl. Phys. **B250** (1985) 327.
19. S. Peris and E. de Rafael, Phys. Lett. **B387** (1996) 603.
20. A.I. Vainshtein and V.I. Zakharov, Phys. Rev. Lett. **73** (1994) 1207; ibidem, Phys. Rev. **D54** (1996) 4039.
21. S. Peris and E. de Rafael, Nucl. Phys. **B500** (1997) 325.
22. S. Narison and R. Tarrach, Phys. Lett. **B125** (1983) 217.
23. M. Beneke, V.M. Braun and N. Kivel Phys. Lett. **B404** (1997) 315.
24. Y. Nambu and G. Jona-Lasinio, Phys. Rev. **122** (1961) 345.
25. J. Bijnens, C. Bruno and E. de Rafael, Nucl. Phys. **B390** (1993) 501. For a recent review where many references can be found see, e.g., J. Bijnens, Phys. Reports **265** (1996) 369.
26. J. Gasser and H. Leutwyler, Nucl. Phys. **B250** (1985) 465
27. J. Polchinski, Effective Field Theory and the Fermi Surface, Lectures presented at TASI 92, hep-th/9210046.

Discussions

A. Di Giacomo, Pisa.

In studying field correlators on the lattice (talk by M. D'Elia), the UV cutoff can be changed and moved towards the IR one by the “cooling” technique. Can your analysis help in disentangling the contribution of renormalons to the gluon condensate by looking at the cutoff dependence of the data ?

S. Peris

Given my present understanding I don't quite see how. Four-quark operators either in the form of eq. (13) or eq. (19) are always related to UV renormalons, i.e. to the regime where the virtual gluon momentum k_E is much larger than the external momentum Q . However, the gluon condensate is related to IR renormalons, i.e. to the opposite situation $Q \gg k_E$.